P. notigerc, Stal (Brazil), is only known to me by the description; it is probably a true Pygidicrana.
$P$. caffir, Dohrn, and $P$. demeli, Dohrn, are only known to me by their description and by drawings ; the position which I have allotted them by analogy may well be correct.
P. alnormis, Borm., is the type of Tomopyija, Burr (1904). P. büttneri, Karsch, is the type of Karschiella, Verhoeff.

## MISCELLANEOUS.

## Contributions towards a Revision of the Genus Lomanotus: a Postseript.

1 regret to find that the survey of the literature of the genus Lomenotus given in the paper which appeared under the above title in the August issue of these 'Annals' is incomplete, in so far as it includes no reference to Sir C. Mliot's raluable "Notes on some British Nindibranchs," contributed to vol. iii. of the 'Journal of the Marine Biological Association' in 1906. Unfortmately the existcnee of these "Notes" did not come to my knowledge until some three weeks after the appearance of the August issue of the 'Annal:. Having read the section of the "Notes" dealing with Lomenotus (1p. 348-3.53) I find it necessary to alter my views as to the position of $L$. portlundicus. Hancock's unpublished drawings s! 10 w that this species possesses what appears to be the most important specifie character of Trinehese's $L$. cisigiz, a fin-like candal process, so that the two species may be considered as identical. While still retaining two species in the genus, I desire, then, to alter the arrangement proposed in the August number of the 'Amals, (pp. 217-218) to the following, L. portlandicus (1860) taking preecdence of L. cisigii (1883):-
(1) L. marmoratus, Ald. \& Hanc. (1845).
L. genei, Yérany (1St6).
L. hancocki, Norman (1877).
(2) L. portlandicus, Thompson (1860).
L. cisigii, Trinchese (1883).

Whether this prorisional arrangement is to stand will depend on the value that may be conceded as a specific distinction to the fin-like caudal process of the second species as deseribed by Trinchese and figured by Hancock.

